

5-00 P.M.

THE MYSORE EVACUEE INTEREST (SEPARATION)
SUPPLEMENTARY BILL, 1961.

Motion to consider.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I beg to move :

“ That the Mysore Evacuee Interest (Separation) Supplementary Bill 1961, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The Motion moved :

“ That the Mysore Evacuee Interest (Separation) Supplementary Bill. 1961. be taken into consideration.”

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, in the year 1951, Parliament enacted a law known as the Evacuee Interest Abolition Act. That act affects list II of the Schedule 7 of the Constitution. Therefore the State Governments were requested to enact supplementary legislation to make that act applicable to the States. Accordingly, supplementary legislation was enacted in the Legislature not only in Mysore but in other States also. Last year Parliament enacted an amending law.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I want to know whether the parent Act has been adopted by this House.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Yes, long time back. In view of the amendment by Parliament, we have to enact a supplementary legislation adopting the Act of Parliament.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—We want information on two points : one, the date on which this House adopted the parent legislation and two, the date on which the Parliament passed the amending law.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—That was in 1953.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Can it be said that it applies to the entire State in view of the fact that there has been Reorganisation of States from 1st November 1956.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—That legislation has been adopted by all the States, by Mysore, Madras and Bombay. Coorg also has adopted, I believe. In 1953 that legislation was adopted in the Mysore Legislature.....

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I raise to a point of order. Can the Minister standing in his place, ask the Law Secretary who is sitting in the Officers' Gallery. This sort of thing has never happened in a democratic set-up or in any legislature, not even in Parliament. The Law Secretary also replied from his gallery. I am very definite that what the Minister did was absolutely in the wrong. The Minister should have gone to the Gallery and obtained the information and not try to get it from where he is standing. A ruling may be given on this now or if the Chair wants to find out precedents, he may give the ruling later.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—There is no serious matter involved. The Minister had all the information with him and there was no need for him to obtain information from any other source.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—But he did not ask the Law Secretary in your presence. We have not shut our eyes to what has happened. It should not be ignored like this.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is a very small matter and I do not think it warrants an interruption of the proceedings.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It is not so unimportant. You cannot brush it aside.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Even apart from the vehemence and all that, there is a point involved, I must say. The matter would not be pressed if the Hon'ble Minister said he never intended it. But I must submit that such a thing is not done anywhere. In regard to that matter I am very definite. The difference between me and my Hon'ble Friend Sri Muckannappa is that I cannot make a big speech like him. But such a thing does not happen and it should not happen.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is nothing for me to regret.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I will then begin to explain. You wanted some information so that you may clarify the position in respect of the point raised by the Hon'ble Members of this House and you would be at perfect liberty to go up and get the information from official sources. There is a procedure prescribed. From your seat, you cannot ask what has happened. That is definitely wrong. In fact, I want to press the point if the Revenue Minister does not concede that it was a mistake. If he does not want to say so, let the Chair give a ruling.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—After all it happened in a formal manner. Let us ignore it.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Some point was raised and I turned that side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I will now give my finding. I too observed the Revenue Minister. When a Member stands here he can turn this side and that. There should be no objection on this score.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Before you give a ruling will you bear with me. Let us know the case properly.

Sri K. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—He has already given a ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I heard it from the mouth of the Minister. He says that he needs no information from any source. He has got all the information. When he does not need any more information, where is the point involved?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The Minister was in need of information.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I got the information just now here.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The Hon'ble Revenue Minister is generally very correct and usually he knows the point involved but I do not know why he is rigid today. I am very clear in my mind that what he did is something unusual. He must have got the information now; I do not blame him for it. From his seat he cannot turn to the Law Secretary or any other Secretary and ask 'what is the matter; That is what has happened and if that is accepted, I have nothing more to say. That is what has happened.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIAH.—The Minister for Revenue was behaving all right since a long time but only just now when the Minister for Co-operation came and sat by his side, he has changed.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have never changed the statement. Somebody raised the question. It is a fact. I was replying when somebody asked whether the act applies to Coorg. I turned that side. What I intended to speak was not audible. I made some gesture, I admit. I wanted to know from him...

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You are correct in parts when you say you turned that side, but that was not merely a gesture but you asked "What is the matter." Why should I say something which is not true. The Hon'ble Revenue Minister said "what is the matter" and the Law Secretary then made some notes and gave it. That however is not the proper procedure. That is the point which I want to stress. The Hon'ble Minister should recognise the point and say that he is sorry.....

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is nothing for me to regret or to be ashamed of my conduct. I have not done anything for which I should regret.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You cannot obtain any information by a gesture to the gallery. That is the point raised.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I do not agree with my friend Mr. Mallaradhy. A point of order has been raised.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—There is no point of order.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My point of order is that it is not correct for a Minister to consult his officers standing in his seat. It is open to go to them and get the information.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—May I appeal to the Hon'ble Members on the opposite? It is a small matter. It is true I turned that side. But I did not cry out as you say. No doubt, my intention was to get information. I only nodded my head. (*laughter*) I humbly suggest that it is not a fit matter for a point of order and it may be dropped.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I do not press the point, Sir.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, what happens to my point of order? It is I who raised the point.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I do not agree with Mr. Mallaradhy. You can certainly give a ruling that the Minister is quite at liberty to consult the officers. There is nothing wrong in it.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Shall I take it for granted that your ruling is that Ministers can stand in their seats and consult officer?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, for Coorg the Central Act applies because the Parliament had power to legislate for Union list and concurrent list. With regard to the other point, the Evacuee Separation (Amendment) Act, 1960 was passed by Parliament, I know that it came into force in October 1960.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIIYA.—You could have brought up the Bill in November.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There after, there was some correspondence between the Government of India and this Government. Later, they suggested that we may promulgate an ordinance. Such ordinances are in force in other States too, because one year's time was given for preferring applications in order to determine the interest of the evacuee and non-evacuee. Therefore, we had to resort to this ordinance.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟಿನ ಒಬ್ಬಿಗೆ ದೊರೆಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಸೆಷನ್ಸ್ ನವೆಂಬರು ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆದಾಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮಗ್ರವಾಗಿ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಆಗಲೇ ಸೂಚಿಸಿ ಸಂಪದಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈಗ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಾರಾವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದರೂ ತರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸೆಷನ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಛೇದಕಾದರೂ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಇಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ.

“No application under this Section shall be entertained if filed after the expiry of one year after the Commencement of the evacuee Interest (Separation) (Amendment) Act, 1960.”

ಯಾವನೋ ಕೈತಪ್ಪಿ ದೇಶ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಹೋಗಿ ಏನೋ ತೊಂದರೆಯಿಂದ ಬಾಯಿರೆ ದೆಸೆಯಿಂದ ಪರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಅಂತಹವನಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಚೈನ್ ಲಮಿಟೇಷನ್ ಹಾಕುವುದು ತುಂಬ ಬಾಧಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟನ್ನು ಹಾಳುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿಂದುಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದನ್ನು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ತಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಲೂ ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಇವಕ್ಕೊಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ನಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾತು ನಡೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಾತೇ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದು ಪಾಸಾದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಕಿರಿಕಿರಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಾಲಿಡ್ ರೀಜನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆನೇ ಆಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಂಡೋರ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚೈನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಡಿ. ನಾವೇನಾದರೂ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದರೆ ನಿಮಗೇ ಅವಮಾನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸ್ಪರ್ಶ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನೀವು ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವೇನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದಲೇ ನಾನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ

ಈ ಮನೂಬೆಗೆ ಯಾವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತರದೇ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಿಷ್ಟೆ, ನಾವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ಫಾರ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಿನ್ಸಿಪಲ್ನನ್ನು ಇಬ್ಬುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಿನ್ಸಿಪಲ್ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಯಬಾರದು. ಜನತೆಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಎರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಾಗಲಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದರೂ ಪರವಾಇಲ್ಲ. ನ್ಯಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ನಾನು ತಂದ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಡಿಫಿಟ್ ಆಗದೇ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನೀವಾದರೂ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಮಗೆ ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನೀವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂತಹ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನನ್ನು ನೀವು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ನವಂಬರ್ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲೆಯೇ ಇದನ್ನು ತರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆ ತದವನ್ನು ಕಂಡೋರ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನೀವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದರೆ ಈಗಲೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The Hon'ble Member has not understood the scope of the discussion of this Bill. We are only to enact a supplementary legislation with a view to adopting the Central Act passed in the month of October 1960. The previous Act had been approved by Legislature. An amendment has been made by Parliament restricting the time limit for preferring claims to one year. That amendment will have to be approved by the State Legislature.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIIYA.—Otherwise is it that we have no powers? Why do you bring it before this House then?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If the State Legislature is competent to enact this law, should not the Legislature be given an opportunity to discuss the main Bill as it is. The Government by bringing an Act enacted by Parliament in this manner is depriving the Legislature of its right of moving any amendments. What is the amendment that we can move to this? We cannot say that the time for submitting claims should be extended by one more year. If it is really the function of the State and if this item falls in the State List then a separate legislation in respect of this matter should have been brought separately and this House should have been given an opportunity to discuss all the provisions, but now what has become law there is simply sought to be enacted as law here. This is only by way of abundant caution and not more than that.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—You are correct. This is only a formal thing. We will have to agree with the Central Act passed by Parliament. Hon'ble Members must remember that we have sent our representative to Parliament and that the original Act had been adopted by the State Legislature.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Under section 4 of the parent Act the State Government is required to appoint officers for administration of this Act. We would like to know whether the State Government is spending any money for the administration of the parent Act. If we are

(Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN)

bearing any portion of the expenditure then we should be given an opportunity to make observations.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is it or is it not open to this House to differ from or to amend this particular piece of legislation?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Hon'ble Members have got the right to differ from the Act passed by Parliament, but it is a question of adjustment. We will have to concede the request of the Government of India.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I do not think that is material. If the Minister agrees that it is open to this House to discuss this, I am afraid he cannot say that we must accept what is sent by the Government of India. Where is the obligation cast on us?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is in the national interest to do so. Parliament has approved of it. We have adopted the original Act. It is in the interest of the country that we agree to put a time limit.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Please do not consider for a moment that Parliament has got the supreme wisdom in such matters. There can be valuable contribution that this House can make in giving a shape to this Bill if re-shaping is called for. Unless you convince this House that there is no scope for differing from this Bill, you cannot fetter the discretion of this House.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is no scope for giving a different interpretation.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—How do you say that there is no scope?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Because this is in the interest of the country.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Unless this is a matter which is in the Concurrent List or only in the Central List and not in the State List, what is the legal difficulty involved?

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—There are no restrictions on the powers of this House to consider the Bill in any way it likes as any other matter that comes before the House. It can accept, reject or amend it and so my friend Sri Mallaradhyas need not be anxious about the powers of the House. As any motion that comes before the House, we have ample discretion to treat it as we like within the limits of our powers.

As the Minister has rightly observed, the Principal law is enacted by the Parliament and all that we are called upon to do is to adapt this Bill so as to make it applicable to this State. There is no point in raising a hypothetical case. We have got the power, but the point is whether we should exercise it in a particular manner. The Minister has stated that the Bill has been passed by the Parliament into an Act. In the interests of evacuees, by passing this Amendment, we are only attracting the

operation of the Act to our State. That is all. Let us not hard upon our constitutional right, and argue whether we have a right to reject it. My submission is that we have got that power; but it is not proper to use that power without any logic or without any reason.

5-30 P.M.

† Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am not prepared to surrender the privileges of this House even to the Parliament or the Mother of Parliaments. I am as zealous as anybody else to safeguard the rights and privileges of this House. We are fettering our right to discuss, merely on the ground that the Parliament has passed it. Without meaning any disrespect to the Parliament, I must say that we are not prepared to take everything for granted. Let us apply our mind and let us see what is there in it; when the times comes let us make a suggestion which at the time had not occurred to the Parliament in its wisdom. Let us have a clarification whether there is any legal difficulty.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—So far as the State subjects coming under the State List are concerned, if any enactment is made by the Parliament, we are at liberty to bring amendments; so far as the other subjects under Concurrent or Central List are concerned, I do not think we have got power to make changes even if we feel inclined to do so.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Our rules do not permit an amendment of a negative character. The only amendment that we can move to this Bill is to negative it, to say that it should not be taken into consideration. We cannot do anything because the parent Act is not before us.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The Parent Act is not under consideration. Now we are considering the amendment passed by the Parliament. My friend Sri Mallaradhyia wanted to know whether this House has got the right to amend the Central Act. If the Central Act falls within the scope of the Concurrent List or State list, this House has got power to amend, but in this particular case the amendment made by the Parliament is in the interests of the country. I would appeal to the House that we may accept....

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—If we have no voice, why bring it before this House?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—We can reject, but I would appeal to the House and say that under the circumstances, we have to agree.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—I request the Minister to withdraw this Ordinance and to replace the Ordinance with a new Bill on the 20th or 21st so that we will be able to move some amendment to the Bill.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The Honourable Members had enough time to move amendments.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—He has lost that opportunity.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—We are not responsible for losing that opportunity.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—Amendment to the provision is with reference to the Parent Act. When the parent Act is not before us, we cannot have any control in this Bill.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The parent Act is in force in the State.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I would like to offer a few remarks on this Bill. I feel I should throw some light on the subject-matter. The amendment is very simple in that we have enacted a law and we have accepted it as the principal Act also in this House. If we read the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it is very clear. It seems to refer to the State List. A difficulty may arise at any stage as to whether a particular evacuee property is covered by the State List or the Central List and therefore to obviate the legal complications that may arise between evacuee and non-evacuee and between the State List and the Central List, this amendment is sought to be made.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—The time allotted for this Bill is already over because only 15 minutes time is allotted.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I am on my legs.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—When the Business Advisory Committee has fixed the time, that 15 minutes for the Bill, is it fair for us to sit and discuss the Bill even after half an hour has passed.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I have got one word to say about it. I wish the leader of the Opposition has patience enough at least for me to conclude the sentence.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—I do not want that the time of the House should be wasted unless the House agree. The time allotted is over. I do not know whether the Speaker has got power even to put the motion to vote at this stage, unless it is approved by the House.

(Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair)

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, there are two things to be decided. First is, the Hon'ble Speaker has not moved the Bill for the consideration of this House. I raised the objection at the proper time...

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is too late now.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಒಂದು ಸಾಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ತಾವು ಇಂಥ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿದಾಗರೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ವೇಳೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳಿವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಅನುಮತಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅಂಥಾ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವಂತೆ ಕಾಣಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ಈ ಸಾಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಮುರಿಯುವಂತಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾಳೆ ಇಂಥ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ನಾವೂ ಸಹ ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಬಹುದು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೂ ಬಡಬಹುದು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದರ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ನಾನು ಅನೇಕ ವೇಳೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡೇ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದರ ಹಾಗೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಹಾಯದ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರದ ಮೇರೆನ್ನೇ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಬಹಳ ವಿರಳ. ಇದ್ದರೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಅಂಥಾದ್ದು ಇರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷ ಸ್ಥಾನ ದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದವರು, might have used his discretion. ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರದ ಮೇರೆ ಅವರು ಜಾನ್, ಚೈಮನ್ಸ್ ಅರೋ ಮಾಡಿರಬಹುದು ಹಾಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIA.—The Speaker knows that we have fixed fifteen minutes for this Bill. Without consulting the House, more time is taken. I do not think it is proper for the Chair to put it to the House. The convention is there and always the Speaker used to consult the House. It is not fair to break the convention.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would draw the attention of the Hon'ble Member to rule 231 ;

“No variation in the Allocation of Time Order shall be made except on a motion made with the consent of the Speaker and accepted by the Assembly :

Provided that the Speaker may, after taking the sense of the Assembly, increase the time, not exceeding one hour, without any motion being moved.”

The point is whether the Speaker can make use of this or not. He can, if he wants ; he can give one hour. But, I remember, on a few occasions I have used this power; by and large, I have not used this power and I have left this to the House.

Now, I will put this Bill to the House. The question is :

“That the Mysore Evacuee Interest (Separation) Supplementary Bill, 1961 be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now clauses. There are no amendments. The question is :

“That clauses 1, 2, 3, and the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1, 2, 3, and the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಷ್ಪರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಜಿನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈಗ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ವೇಳೆ ಮುಗಿಯುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದು ಗಂಟೆ ಆಯಿತು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲಿ. ಅನಂತರ ಚಿಂತೆ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರೋಣ.

Motion to pass.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Evacuee Interest (Separation) Supplementary Bill, 1961 be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Evacuee Interest (Separation) Supplementary Bill, 1961 be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

THE MYSORE RENT CONTROL LAWS (CONTINUANCE) BILL 1961.

Motion to Consider.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Rent Control Laws (Continuance) Bill 1961, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Rent Control Laws (Continuance) Bill 1961, be taken into consideration.”

† Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, it is a very simple measure. This is to continue the existing enactment in force in the different regions of the State. Hon'ble Members are aware that a Bill to enact a uniform law has been introduced and it has been referred to the Joint Select Committee and the report, is pending before the Legislature. Therefore, the existing laws will have to be continued and I commend this Bill for the approval of the House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈಗ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮನೂದೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವೇನನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದು ಯಾವಾಗ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—1960ನೇ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ 28ರಲ್ಲಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಬಿಲ್ಲನೆ ಅವಧಿ ಪೂರೈಸಿದ್ದು ಯಾವಾಗ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಕಳೆದ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಈ ಮನೂದೆ ಮೇರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ಒಂದಾವರ್ತಿ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ, ಒಂದಾವರ್ತಿ ಬೈದರೆ, ಹೆದರಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭವಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವು ಅಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಬೇಕೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯೇ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ನಾವು ಅಷ್ಟು ಬೈದು ಕಟುವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವಾದುದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಬೈದು ಸಾಕಾಗಿಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಧಾನಸೌಧ ಕಟ್ಟಿದಾರಭ್ಯದಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ನಡೆಸಿತೋ ಅಂದರೆ ಆ ಶ್ರೀ ಚಿಂಗಲರಾಯರೆಡ್ಡಿ, ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ—ಹೀಗೆ ಯಾರ್ಯಾರೋ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿದ್ದರು ; ಆ ಕಾಲದಿಂದಲೇ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯವು ಒಂದು ಆರ್ಥಿಕವಾಗಿ ರಾಜ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಕಳೆದ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರಿನಲ್ಲೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೂ, ಕಳೆದ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರಿನಲ್ಲೇ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ನಡೆಸಿದ್ದರೂ ಆಗ ಇದರ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇನ್ನೆರಡು ದಿವಸ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಕುಳಿತು ಆ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ರೆಂಟ್ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲ್ ಅಜ್ಞೆಯಿಂದ ಅಷ್ಟು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ—ಅಷ್ಟು ಜನರೇ ತೊಂದರೆ ಆಗಿದೆ